Director Hernandez called the meeting to order at the hour of 10:03 a.m.

Present: Director Hernandez
          Director Elitharp
          Assistant General Manager Scaglione
          District Engineer Gumpel
          Capital Facilities Senior Engineer Hubbard
          Meter Services Supervisor Kirby
          Administrative Secretary Johnson

Others Present: Rosalyn Prickett, Sr. Water Resources Planner, Woodard & Curran
                Scott Goldman, Sr. Environmental Engineer, Woodard & Curran

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION ON AMI INFRASTRUCTURE

Assistant General Manager Scaglione stated the District currently utilizes Automated Meter Reading (AMR) technology whereby meter reads are obtained by staff driving through a neighborhood rather than walking a route and reading meters manually. In 2013, the District considered converting water metering from AMR to Advanced Meter Infrastructure (AMI) technology which would receive meter reads transmitted from individual meters to the District headquarters via strategically placed antennas and equipment. The cost of conversion at that time would have been approximately $5.3 million. Management felt the benefits did not outweigh the cost and decided to reconsider conversion at a later date.

Assistant General Manager Scaglione explained how AMR and AMI technology works. The most expensive component of the conversion is the upgrade of each meter’s radio transceiver (Endpoint) to provide AMI compatibility. The District has more AMI-compatible Endpoints today than in 2013. The cost to purchase Endpoints for a full conversion today would be approximately $2.8 million, plus other expenses such as installing towers, software, and labor.

Staff has discussed a possible pilot project with Olivenhain Municipal Water District (OMWD) staff to determine the potential for cost sharing and to define the pilot project as regional to be more competitive when pursuing grant funds. The District’s Double Peak tank is a mutually beneficial site for a tower to be installed. A propagation study would need to be completed to determine the number of meters/signals that can be picked up at
specific locations, how many towers would be necessary, and where the towers should be located. In order to update the 2013 propagation study, a 60-foot tower will need to be installed at Double Peak to replace the existing tower. The cost of the study is approximately $600.

Staff will provide the Committee with an update once the propagation study has been completed and the project has been defined.

General discussion took place regarding the benefits of the conversion from AMR to AMI, possible shared costs with OMWD, propagation study timeline, overall costs and time savings, and the potential for grant funding.

GROUNDWATER FUNDING

District Engineer Gumpel stated he met with Rosalyn Prickett and Scott Goldman of Woodard & Curran to discuss funding possibilities for a groundwater feasibility study that would provide options to the District on how to use groundwater: recycled, desalted or potable. The study would cost approximately $55,000 or $65,000 if optional associated legal tasks are included.

Ms. Prickett stated no funding is available in advance of the study; however, there may be several options for cost recovery, depending on how the water will be used. The scope of the feasibility study is structured to explore the three options as far as possible with desktop data and then determine what the next steps would be depending on the path the District selects.

General discussion took place regarding the three groundwater use options and historical water rights. The feasibility study would be the first step, then determining how the water will be used, and after that, pursuing funds for the preferred option.

Ms. Prickett distributed and reviewed a list of funding options which included an overview of each option, eligible projects, application deadlines and suggestions/considerations. The funding programs include grants and low-interest loans.

Staff will revise the scope and fee of the study to be presented to the Board in December or January. The Committee will report to the Board their recommendation to authorize the feasibility study including optional legal tasks.

MEN’S LOCKER ROOM UPDATE

District Engineer Gumpel summarized the project modifications per the Board’s direction to reduce costs which included deleting rehab of the existing men’s and women’s bathrooms, and lowering the wall height.

Capital Facilities Senior Engineer Hubbard provided updated plans for the men’s locker room project. He reviewed the base bid (522 square feet) and alternate base bid (783
square feet). Modifications included limited new sidewalk replacements, concrete flooring instead of epoxy flooring, painted walls instead of tile, concrete tilt-up wall changed to painted stucco, reduced wall height, no replacements of existing facilities, and incorporating HVAC instead of hiring a third party. Both base bids include all of the reductions; the difference between the bids is the alternate bid includes additional showers, sinks and lockers.

Capital Facilities Senior Engineer Hubbard stated he does not have the new specs or Architect’s Estimate yet. Staff will be reviewing the plans in detail. Due to the upcoming holidays, staff may not have an opportunity to bring this project back to the Committee before the end of the year.

It was decided that once the plans are completed and the estimate is received, staff will put the project out to bid. General Manager Pruim will be notified when this takes place, probably before the end of the year, and can provide a verbal update to the Board in January.

OTHER BUSINESS

Director Hernandez requested the status on the solar Request for Proposal (RFP). District Engineer Gumpel stated proposals to hire a consultant have been received from three consultants, but have not been reviewed by staff yet. After the proposals have been reviewed, negotiation and or selection will take place, and interviews will be conducted if necessary, before bringing it to the Committee and the Board. Staff may not be ready with this in time for the next Committee meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at the hour of 11:24 a.m.